



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/915,425

07/26/2001

Jordan Pollack

\*\*13-0006

6994

23377 7590 09/09/2009

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP  
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR  
2929 ARCH STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

CHAO, MICHAEL W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2442

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/09/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/915,425	<b>Applicant(s)</b> POLLACK, JORDAN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Michael Chao	<b>Art Unit</b> 2442	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29, 38 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29, 38 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2442

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 14, 16-26, 28, 39, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanna et al. (US 7054905), in view of Karim (U.S. 6654892), in view of Boaz et al. (US 5,333,266).

With respect to claims 1, 18, 19, 25, 39, Hanna teaches; A system for management and manipulation of stored files through electronic mail items comprising: a first receiving portal configured to receive, from a sender, a first electronic mail item addressed to a recipient, wherein the first electronic mail item comprises a file; (“sender 102 sends email message 202 (including attachment 204) to email server 108” Hanna column 4 line 20)

a mail processor configured to produce a stripped electronic mail item by removing the file from the first electronic mail item and replacing it with a corresponding file handle; (“Email server 108 also forwards email message 292 along with URL” Hanna column 4 line 31)

a storage device configured to store the file; (“Email server 108 sends attachment 204 to file server 111” Hanna column 4 line 30)

1 a mail deliverer configured to send the stripped electronic mail item to the  
2 recipient; ("Email server 108 also forwards email message 292 along with URL" Hanna  
3 column 4 line 31)

4 a rights verifier configured to determine whether the recipient has privilege to  
5 access the stored file corresponding to said file handle; ("DLE 110 keeps track of a set  
6 of recipients specified in a distribution list" Hanna column 3 line 65)

7 a second receiving portal configured to receive, from the recipient including a first  
8 field which contains a user identification, a second field which contains the file handle  
9 ("In order to receive attachment 204, recipient 114 may have to be authenticated to file  
10 server 111" Hanna column 5 line 62)

11 [allowing access] when the recipient is verified to have privilege to access the  
12 stored file. ("access control list" Hanna column 5 line 50)

13 Hanna does not teach;

14 a second electronic mail item including a first field which contains a user  
15 identification, a second field which contains the file handle, and a third field which  
16 contains a command specification;

17 and a fourth field which contains a command argument

18 a file handle recognizer configured to locate a file handle pattern within the  
19 second electronic mail item; and

20 a command executor configured to execute said command specification with said  
21 command argument on the stored file retrieved from said storage device

22 Karim teaches the following limitations:

1 configured to receive, from the recipient a second electronic mail item including a  
2 first field which contains a user identification, (Karim, Figure 2, item 204, source) a  
3 second field which contains the file handle, (Karim, Figure 2, item 214, Filename) and a  
4 third field which contains a command specification, (Karim, Figure 2, item 212  
5 command; “the command is obtained from the client e-mail at block 706 and the  
6 associated file name is obtained at block 708” Karim column 8 line 57)

7 a file handle recognizer configured to locate a file handle pattern within the  
8 second electronic mail item; and (“the command is obtained from the client e-mail at  
9 block 706 and the associated file name is obtained at block 708” Karim column 8 line  
10 57)

11 a command executor configured to execute said command specification with said  
12 command argument on the stored file retrieved from said storage device (“The  
13 execution engine may therefore identify the command data structure and retrieve any  
14 associated files” Karim column 9 line 30)

15 A person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the invention of Karim  
16 with Hanna by including an email file transaction system as shown in Karim into the file  
17 server of Hanna.

18 It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of  
19 ordinary skill in the art to include a file transaction system to allow users to control  
20 access and update the file on the file server.

21 Further the combination of Hanna in view of Karim does not explicitly teach that  
22 the fourth field is a parameter for the command specification.

1           Boaz teaches commands for a unified communication system, one of which is to  
2 forward a message; "Typical voice sever functions include: create, revise, send, forward  
3 and append voice mail items" Boaz column 4 line 30. The command parameters for the  
4 forward command are explicitly listed in column 31/32 as the SENDTEXT command  
5 "SENDTEXT (TSUSERID, TSNODE, TSSEQUENCE, TVMSGID, TMSG, SUBJECT,  
6 SENDTYPE, DELIVERYFLAGS, TSUSERLIST\_receivers)". While not all the  
7 parameters would be required for a message to be forwarded in Hanna in view of  
8 Karim, it is evident that SENDTYPE (forward; command specification) and  
9 TSUSERLIST\_receivers (who to forward to; command argument) would both be  
10 required.

11           A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have modified  
12 Hanna in view of Karim with Boaz by including the commonly known functionality of a  
13 message management system as well as the interface fields required to implement  
14 such commands in the communication structure of Hanna in view of Karim. It would  
15 have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in  
16 the art to modify Hanna in view of Karim with Boaz in order to support typical messaging  
17 command functions, or alternatively in order to allow "a request from a local terminal to  
18 access message functions from a foreign messaging system." (Boaz column 2 line 23)

19           Regarding claim 2, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: wherein the  
20 file handle recognizer is configured for locating conforming file handle patterns within  
21 the body of the electronic mail item. ("the command is obtained from the client e-mail at

1 block 706 and the associated file name is obtained at block 708” Karim column 8 line  
2 57)

3       Regarding claim 4, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: further  
4 including a command parser which recognizes and assembles a command out of the  
5 information extracted from the electronic mail item (“The execution engine may  
6 therefore identify the command data structure and retrieve any associated files” Karim  
7 column 9 line 30).

8       Regarding claim 5, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: wherein the  
9 command specification instructs said command executor to delete the file from said  
10 storage device. (“From the file option, a user can select Properties, Move, Discard,  
11 Send and Dial operations.” Boaz column 21 line 12).

12       Regarding claim 6, the combination discussed above teaches; wherein the  
13 command specification instructs said command executor to retrieve the file as an email  
14 attachment. (“where the client code control command is a check out command, the  
15 content of the file being checked out of the source code control system may be provided  
16 as an attachment file” Karim column 7 line 22)

17       Regarding claim 7, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: wherein the  
18 command specification instructs said command executor to forward the file to a third  
19 party as an email attachment. (“the system allows recipient 114 to forward URL 206 to  
20 another recipient” Hanna column 6 line 32)

21       Regarding claim 8, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: wherein the  
22 command specification instructs said command executor to forward to a third party (“the

1 system allows recipient 114 to forward URL 206 to another recipient" Hanna column 6  
2 line 32) a newly constructed ("it may be desirable to use a different URL to refer to the  
3 same file, so that the file can be copied" Hanna column 5 line 20) file handle to the file  
4 stored on said storage device.

5       Regarding claim 9, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: wherein the  
6 command specification instructs said command executor to print the file on a fax  
7 machine at a specified telephone number. ("image or text document be faxed to a  
8 remote phone number for review" Boaz column 24 line 45).

9       Regarding claim 10, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: further  
10 including at least one of an optical character recognition device, automatic speech  
11 recognition device, language translation device, and a file format translation device  
12 associated with said command executor. ("Also in memory 100 are Text to Speech and  
13 Speech to Text Code Module 140, and Optical Character Recognition to Text . . ." Boaz  
14 column 7 line 43).

15       Regarding claim 14, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: wherein the  
16 storage device further includes an automatic deletion timer associated with at least one  
17 of the stored files. ("the system deletes attachment . . . automatically after an expiration  
18 of a time period" Hanna column 6 line 17)

19       Regarding claim 16, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: wherein  
20 said file handle is a uniform resource locator. ("recipient 114 uses URL 206 to send a  
21 request 208 for attachment" Hanna column 4 line 32)



1           Regarding claim 17, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: wherein the  
2 storage device is chosen from the group consisting of hard drives, optical drives,  
3 random access memories, tape drives, RAID arrays, and storage area networks. (“disk  
4 drive” Hanna column 3 line 24)

5           Regarding claims 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz  
6 teaches: hard drive (“disk drive” Hanna column 3 line 24), optical drive (“CDs and  
7 DVDs” Hanna column 3 line 24), ROM, RAM, (Karim column 11 line 30) and a tape  
8 drive. (“magnetic tape” Hanna column 3 line 24)

9           Regarding claims 26, 28, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: a  
10 general-purpose computer system. (Karim column 11 line 24)

11  
12           Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanna in  
13 view of Karim in view of Boaz in view of Hussey (U.S. 5826269), in view of Checkoway  
14 et al. (US 20020035607)

15           Regarding claim 3, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: further  
16 including a user identification system which extracts information from the electronic mail  
17 item including the from address, destination address (“the present invention preferably  
18 handles only those e-mails that are addressed to the source code control system” Karim  
19 column 4 line 57), the subject, the reply-to, and the body of the electronic mail item  
20 (“implement a password or identifier code” Karim column 4 line 57), to enable  
21 verification of the sender as a known user of the system. (“any number of  
22 authentication mechanisms” Hanna column 5 line 65). The combination discussed

1 above does not explicitly recite that the 'from address', the subject, or the 'reply-to' fields  
2 are used in determining the sender. teaches a from address, and a subject extraction;  
3 "the subject field is utilized in conjunction with . . . in order to process the email request  
4 in a specific manner" (Hussey column 8 line 50); "whether the identified sender is  
5 authorized to submit the SQL request" (Hussey column 8 line 30). A person of ordinary  
6 skill in the art would have used the invention of Hussey with the combination discussed  
7 above by explicitly using the from and subject fields in command requests to separate  
8 password and command identifiers. It would have been obvious at the time the  
9 invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use these fields in order to  
10 create a command structure compatible with legacy email systems. Furthermore, this  
11 combination does not disclose the use of a 'reply-to' field. Checkoway discloses that a  
12 'reply-to' field may be used in lieu of a from field in determining the sender of an email.  
13 A person of ordinary skill would have used this concept of Checkoway with the  
14 combination discussed above by further using a reply-to field to determine the identity of  
15 the requester of the service. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was  
16 made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the reply-to field to determine the  
17 identity of a sender since it should also represent the sending entity.

18  
19  
20 Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanna  
21 in view of Karim in view of Boaz in view of Pearl et al. (US 20020083035).

22 Regarding claim 11, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz does not explicitly  
23 teach: wherein the command specification instructs said command executor to convert

1 the file to plain text and email it back to the sender. Pearl discloses such a feature;  
2 “translates the content to a text format compatible for display on the wireless device”  
3 (Pearl paragraph [0006]). A person of ordinary skill in the art would have used the  
4 conversion method of Perl with the combination discussed above by converting the file  
5 to a format usable by the receiving device. It would have been obvious at the time the  
6 invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to enable the combination  
7 discussed above to perform this conversion in order to allow a user to “view the text  
8 data on [a] wireless device from the delivered e-mail message” (Pearl paragraph [0006])  
9

10 Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanna  
11 in view of Karim in view of Boaz in view of Tverskoy et al. (US 20010043678).

12 Regarding claim 12, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz teaches: wherein the  
13 command specification instructs said command executor to convert the file to an audio  
14 file and to forward the audio file to a telephone at a specified number. Boaz discloses  
15 the conversion to an audio file with the reasoning listed in this office action in claim 10.

16 Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz does not teach: that the audio file is  
17 forwarded to a telephone number. This is taught by Tverskoy; “E-mail command  
18 messages may also be used to cause answering machine 12 to place a telephone call  
19 and play a recorded message.” (Tverskoy paragraph [0038]). A person of ordinary skill  
20 in the art would have used the call feature of Tverskoy with the combination above by  
21 allowing a command to allow text documents to be dictated over a telephone line. It  
22 would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary

1 skill in the art to use the call feature of Tverskoy with the combination above in order to  
2 “document or a portion thereof [to] be reviewed” (Boaz column 24 line 30).

3  
4 Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanna  
5 in view of Karim in view of Boaz in view of Martin (US 6432232).

6 Regarding claim 13, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz does not teach;  
7 wherein the command specification instructs the command executor to print the file at a  
8 printer, and to instruct a mailing component to insert the printed file into a postal mail  
9 system. Martin teaches said feature; “it is an object of the subject invention to provide  
10 an inexpensive system that can automatically generate finished letter mail, of several  
11 pages if desired, at lightly attended remote terminals, so long as the system is  
12 electronically connected to a computer, anywhere in the world when tied to the internet  
13 and E-mail” (Martin column 1 line 66). A person of ordinary skill in the art would have  
14 combined the invention of Martin with the combination discussed above by using a  
15 device like Martins with the combination discussed above and allowing interoperation  
16 thereof. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of  
17 ordinary skill in the art to include such a device in order to allow for a sender “to be sure  
18 that the recipient gets a hard copy” of the mail. (Martin column 1 line 65).

19  
20 Claim 15, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanna  
21 in view of Karim in view of Boaz in view of Ryan et al. (US 6205434).

1           Regarding claim 15, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz does not teach:  
2   wherein the command specification instructs the command executor to change the date  
3   of autodeletion of the file. Ryan discusses such a deletion timer; "At Input Block 352, the  
4   user enters the delete-date" (Ryan column 32 line 60). A person of ordinary skill in the  
5   art would have used the input of Ryan with the system of Karim by allowing a user to set  
6   a date that the file should be discarded. It would have been obvious at the time the  
7   invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a delete date with  
8   Karim in order to free up space from unused files on the system.

9  
10           Claims 27, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over  
11   Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz in view of Gates (US 4969083).

12           Regarding claims 27, 29, Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz does not teach:  
13   a programmable logic controller, or an array of network servers. Gates discloses both  
14   as processing apparatuses. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have used a PLC  
15   or an array of servers with the invention discussed above by installing the system  
16   software on either host machine. It would have been obvious at the time the invention  
17   was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a PLC or an array of servers  
18   dependent upon the capacity requirement of the system install.

19  
20           Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanna  
21   et al. (US 7054905), in view of Karim (U.S. 6654892) in view of Listserv and Singhal  
22   (US 6,256,666).

1 With respect to claims 38 Hanna teaches; A system for management and  
2 manipulation of stored files through electronic mail items comprising:

3 a first receiving portal configured to receive, from a sender, a first electronic mail  
4 item addressed to a recipient, wherein the first electronic mail item comprises a file;  
5 (“sender 102 sends email message 202 (including attachment 204) to email server 108”  
6 Hanna column 4 line 20)

7 a mail processor configured to produce a stripped electronic mail item by  
8 removing the file from the first electronic mail item and replacing it with a corresponding  
9 file handle; (“Email server 108 also forwards email message 292 along with URL”  
10 Hanna column 4 line 31)

11 a storage device configured to store the file; (“Email server 108 sends  
12 attachment 204 to file server 111” Hanna column 4 line 30)

13 a mail deliverer configured to send the stripped electronic mail item to the  
14 recipient; (“Email server 108 also forwards email message 292 along with URL” Hanna  
15 column 4 line 31)

16 a rights verifier configured to determine whether the recipient has privilege to  
17 access the stored file corresponding to said file handle; (“DIE 110 keeps track of a set of  
18 recipients specified in a distribution list” Hanna column 3 line 65)

19 a second receiving portal configured to receive, from the recipient including a first  
20 field which contains a user identification, a second field which contains the file handle  
21 (“In order to receive attachment 204, recipient 114 may have to be authenticated to file  
22 server 111” Hanna column 5 line 62)

1 Hanna does not teach;  
2 a second electronic mail item including a first field which contains a user  
3 identification, a second field which contains the file handle, and a third field which  
4 contains a command specification;  
5 a file handle recognizer configured to locate a file handle pattern within the  
6 electronic mail item; and  
7 a command executor configured to execute said command specification on the  
8 file retrieved from said storage device when the recipient is verified to have the access  
9 rights to the file.

10 Karim teaches such limitations;  
11 configured to receive, from the recipient a second electronic mail item including a  
12 first field which contains a user identification, ("if it is determined at block 504 that the  
13 password is invalid, the e-mail is ignored" Karim column 6 line 40) a second field which  
14 contains the file handle, and a third field which contains a command specification,  
15 without prompting for the email item; ("the command is obtained from the client e-mail at  
16 block 706 and the associated file name is obtained at block 708" Karim column 8 line  
17 57)

18 a file handle recognizer configured to locate a file handle pattern within the  
19 electronic mail item; and ("the command is obtained from the client e-mail at block 706  
20 and the associated file name is obtained at block 708" Karim column 8 line 57)

21 a command executor configured to execute said command specification on the  
22 file retrieved from said storage device when the recipient is verified to have the access

Art Unit: 2442

rights to the file. ("The execution engine may therefore identify the command data structure and retrieve any associated files" Karim column 9 line 30)

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the invention of Karim with Hanna by including an email file transaction system as shown in Karim into the file server of Hanna.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a file transaction system to allow users to control access and update the file on the file server.

Hanna in view of Karim does not disclose: the third field comprising at least part of the To: field of the second electronic mail item and the subject of the [second] electronic mail item. However, the placement of the command data in an email message is not specifically novel, rather it is more a design choice. It was known in the art at the time of invention that the To: field (listserv page 17) as well as the subject line (Singhal, figure 4 item 400) would be desirable locations to hold command data. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would have modified Hanna in view of Karim with Listserv and Singhal by utilizing the various fields in an email message to convey a command. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hanna in view of Karim with Singhal and Listserv in order to conform to whatever packet structure was desired by the engineer.



***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see page 14, filed 07/27/2009, with respect to the 35 USC 103 rejections of claims 1, 18, 19, 25, 38 and 39 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Hanna in view of Karim does not disclose a command parameter nor that the command specification is located in both the to field and the subject field. The rejection of claims 1, 18, 19, 25, 38 and 39 has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hanna in view of Karim in view of Boaz and Hanna in view of Karim in view of Listserv and Singhal.

Applicant's arguments filed 07/27/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument (pages 11-12) that Hanna's distribution list does not teach access rights, or privilege to access, because the email is sent to the users on a distribution list, is not persuasive. While Hanna states that the email is routed to the users on the distribution list (column 3 line 65) it refers to the initial email whose attachment is stripped. The distribution list is further used to create an access control list; "A number of methods can be used to send email to recipients on a distribution list through a DLE, such as DLE 110. (1) the system can place all recipients on an access control list. (2) The system can put the alias for the distribution list on the access control list and can require recipients to prove membership in the alias (or some other related group" Hanna column 5 lines 48-54. Hanna does act to restrict access, and therefore verify a privilege to access.

Applicant's argument (pages 12) that Karim does not verify a privilege to access because Karim's user identification does not necessarily identify a user, is not persuasive. Initially, Karim in figure 2 discloses a source address 204, which, identifies a user. It is true that the "password/identifier" code does not necessarily uniquely identify a user; however such is not required by the claim, nor is it necessary that the "password/identifier" is related to the 'user identifier'. Rather, the claim requires that recipient is verified to have privilege to access; which given a broadest reasonable interpretation would only necessitate some method of restricting access, which could be a group password. Karim discloses such an access limitation; "If the password is not valid, the e-mail may be ignored or discarded at block 610" (Karim column 8 line 36). It is understood that the password of Karim is intended to solve a different issue, more akin to addressing; however its use and result are analogous to the claimed invention.

Applicant's argument (page 13), does not teach the first second and third fields within a single email, is not persuasive. With reference to figure 2, item 204 source, item 214 filename and item 212 command, all exist within a single email. Stated succinctly, "each code access request specifying a code control command and associated file name is packaged in one or more client e-mails. FIG. 2 is a block diagram illustrating an exemplary client e-mail message" (Karim column 4 line 50)

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2442

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Chao whose telephone number is (571)270-5657. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4 Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. C./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2442

/Andrew Caldwell/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2442